

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed April 9, 2004. In order to advance prosecution of this case, Applicants amend Claims 1-7, 18-34, and 36. Applicants cancel Claims 17 and 35 without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-16, 18-34, and 36 remain pending in the Application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Applicants thank the Examiner and his Supervisor for conducting a telephone interview on June 30, 2004. The changes to Claims 1 and 19 being made herein were discussed. Minor changes have been made from the discussed changes for clarity. In addition, differences between the prior art relied on in the Office Action to reject Claims 1 and 19 and the invention were discussed. No agreement was reached as to whether amended Claims 1 and 19 are allowable.

The present application discloses communicating telematic messages among telematic devices using a message router. This includes converting telematic messages received at a router into translated messages having a standard format using a first software object contained in the router and associated with the first telematic device. The router processes the translated message and selects a second telematic device as a destination device to which to communicate the translated message based on a characteristic of the translated message. The translated message is converted using a second software object contained in the router and associated with the second telematic device. While Applicants disagree that the cited portions of the references relied upon by the Office Action disclose all the limitations of the original Claims, in the interest of efficient prosecution Applicants have amended the Claims to clarify the distinctions between the Claims and the cited references. The present invention has advantages over the subject matter disclosed in the references cited in the Office Action and the Claims have been amended to clarify these advantages. Applicants respectfully submit that the Claims as amended are not anticipated by or obvious in light of the portions of the references relied upon by the Examiner.

Section 102 Rejections

The Examiner rejects Claims 1, 6-19, and 24-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0115436 A1 by Howell et al. ("*Howell*"). Applicants contend that Claims 1 and 19, as amended, are not anticipated by *Howell*. The amendments moot the original rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to a method for communicating telematic messages among a plurality of telematic devices using a message router. The method includes the router receiving a telematic message from a telematic device wherein the router and the telematic device are in a vehicle. The telematic message is converted into a translated message having a standard format using a first software object contained in the router and associated with the first telematic device. The router processes the translated message and selects a second telematic device as a destination device to which to communicate the translated message based on a characteristic of the translated message. The translated message is converted using a second software object contained in the router and associated with the second telematic device, and transmitted to the second telematic device. The portions of *Howell* relied upon by the Examiner do not disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of Claim 1.

Howell discloses a satellite transmitting timing and position information to a remote unit and the remote unit receiving these signals and transmitting signals to a wireless transmission system. *See Howell*, Paragraph 27; Figure 1. The cited portions of *Howell* do not disclose a telematic message being converted into a translated message having a standard format using a first software object contained in a router and associated with the first telematic device. Nor do the cited portions of *Howell* disclose the translated message being converted using a second software object contained in the router and associated with the second telematic device, and transmitted to the second telematic device. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from *Howell*, and request that the rejection of Claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 6-16 and 18 each depend from independent Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 6-16 and 18 are patentable over the cited art, for example, for the same reasons discussed above with regard to Claim 1.

Claim 19 is directed to a telematic message router with a processor operable to execute computer software. The computer software is operable to convert a telematic

message into a first translated message having a standard format using a first software object contained in the router and associated with the first telematic device, and process the first translated message. The software is also operable to select a telematic device as a destination device to which to communicate the first translated message based on a characteristic of the first translated message, and convert the first translated message into a second translated message using a second software object contained in the router and associated with the second telematic device. For similar reasons as those discussed above with regard to Claim 1, *Howell* does not disclose, teach, or suggest each of these limitations. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 19 is patentably distinguishable from *Howell*, and request that the rejection of Claim 19 be withdrawn.

Claims 24-36 each depend from independent Claim 19. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 24-36 are patentable over the cited art, for example, for the same reasons discussed above with regard to Claim 19.

Section 103 Rejections

The Examiner rejects Claims 2-4 and 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Howell* in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0137500 A1 by Brooking et al. (“*Brooking*”). Claims 2-4 each depend from independent Claim 1 and Claims 20-22 each depend from independent Claim 19. Because Claims 1 and 19 are neither anticipated by nor obvious in light of the portions of *Howell* and *Brooking* relied upon by the Examiner, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-4 and 20-22 are patentable at least for the same reasons that Claims 1 and 19 are patentable, and request that the rejection of Claims 2-4 and 20-22 be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejects Claims 5 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Howell* in view of *Brooking* and U.S. Patent No. 5,666,398 issued to Schiffel et al. (“*Schiffel*”). Claim 5 depends from independent Claim 1 and Claim 23 depends from independent Claim 19. Because Claims 1 and 19 are neither anticipated by nor obvious in light of the portions of *Howell*, *Brooking* and *Schiffel* relied upon by the Examiner, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 5 and 23 are patentable at least for the same reasons that Claims 1 and 19 are patentable, and request that the rejection of Claims 5 and 23 be withdrawn.

Conclusions

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending Claims. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference or an interview would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicants stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

No fees are believed to be due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-0765 of Electronic Data Systems Corporation.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants



David G. Wille
Reg. No. 38,363

Date: July 9, 2004

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600
Dallas, Texas 75201-2980
(214) 953-6595

Customer Number:

35005